DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 760 EC 103 662

TITLE	The Therapeutic Educational Center for Severely Emotionally Disturbed Pupils. Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION	San Francisco Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	123-1
PUB DATE	30 Jun 73
GRANT	38-68478-01422-1020-2-02
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration; *Demonstration Projects; *Emotionally Disturbed; *Information Dissemination; Inservice Teacher Education; Parent School Relationship; Primary Education; *Program Descriptions; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Presented is the final project report of a 1-year federally funded (Title III) program intended to encourage the adoption of the Therapeutic Educational Center program for severely emotionally disturbed children (6-9 years old) in other California school settings. Explained are the following project activities: dissemination of information, operation of a model demonstration center, selection of other school districts, provision of training seminars, implementation of training seminars, and provision of technical assistance. The project included the following major components: planning for the administration and operation of a program for severely emotionally disturbed children, instructional methods used to teach academic and social skills, and methods used in working with parents and community agencies. It is reported that performance targets were achieved as the project conducted 18 workshop/seminars and one or more of the three major project components was adopted in 16 other school settings. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC

1

ED150760

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

RECEIVED
SEP 14 1973
ESEA, Title III

Final Project Report

THE THERAPEUTIC EDUCATIONAL CENTER

For

Severely Emotionally Disturbed Pupils

Submitted To

The Bureau of Program Planning and Development

Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10)

Steven P. Morena
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco, California

June 30, 1973

EC103662

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Board of Education

David J. Sanchez, Jr., Ph.D., President
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., Vice President
Mrs. James W. Abrahamson
Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.
Mrs. Charlie Mae Haynes
John A. Kidder
Rev. Thomas A. Reed, S.J.

Steven P. Morena
Superintendent of Schools

Martin Dean, Assistant Superintendent
Special Educational Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	Statistical Data	4
II	Data for United States Office of Education	8
III	Program Narrative Report	
	Context	23
	The Locale	
	The School System	
	Needs Assessment	
	Historical Background	
	Program	27
	Scope of the Program	
	Personnel	
	Organizational Details	
	Activities or Services	
	Instructional Equipment and Materials	
	Parent-Community Involvement	
	Budget	
	Special Factors	
	Dissemination	
	Evaluation	39
	Summary Report of Diffusion Activities	
	Procedural Objectives and Findings	
	Project Objective and Findings	
	Adoption/Adaption Activities of The Therapeutic Educational Center Project, 1972-1973	

Final Project Report

ESEA, Title III

II

DATA FOR U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Project No. 123-1
Grant No. 38-68478-01422-1020-2-02
State: California
Final Project Report: July 1, 1972 -- June 30, 1973

COVER PAGE

for Component II

Data for U. S. Office of Education

(To be completed for all projects active for any period between July 1972 - Through June 30, 1973. Agencies having more than one project must prepare a report for each project.)

Enter information for items 1 through 7.

1. 123-1
Project No.

2. The Therapeutic Educational Center for Severely Emotionally Disturbed Children
Project Title

3. San Francisco Unified
Local Educational Agency

135 So. Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94102
Address

4. Steven P. Morena, Superintendent
Name of school official responsible for this report

(415) 863-4680
Phone No.

5. Jane Criner
Name of Project Director

(415) 285-1225
Phone No.

6. The 1972-73 school year has been ..... and final

6.1 [X] The first/year of operation.

6.2 [ ] The second year of operation.

6.3 [ ] The third year of operation.

7. Enter the following ending dates: and final

Ending date for first/year June 30, 1973

Ending date for second year ---

Ending date for third and final year ---

PART I - STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The report should describe project staff development activities that took place during the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973. If no project staff development activities occurred, write NONE in the first column. Staff development activities are those inservice efforts designed to improve competencies of the staff working full or part-time on the project. Enter the figures in columns two and three.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF ONE OR MORE DAYS DURATION 1972-73					
(1) Definition of Staff: (Staff includes all personnel assigned to work on the project full or part time, whether paid by the district or the project.)	(2) Total No. of participants (Unduplicated) in all activities.	(3) No. of workshops, conferences and seminars held by type of training			
		Dissemination to spread information about project	Evaluation to appraise progress	Combination of dissemination & evaluation	Other, such as in-service education. Specify (Use back of this page.)
→	9			36 (mtgs)	10

PART II - EXTENT OF ADOPTION/ADAPTION

1972-1973

The purpose of this section is to find out how many projects are being continued to some extent by the grantee or by other school districts after federal funds have expired.

The report should be limited to projects for which federal funds expired during the period July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973. If the grantee district expects to continue the project to some extent during the next fiscal year, this should be reported by marking the box. The estimated extent of adoption or adaption by the grantee district should be shown by circling the appropriate percentage figure in the scale.

1. The project is being continued by the grantee in some form after federal funds expired. [X] Yes [ ] No

2. If the answer is YES, draw a circle around the one figure which best represents your estimate of the degree of adoption/adaption of the project in your school district.

20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% (80%) 90% 100%

PART II - Continued

3. Is the project being adopted or adapted by other school districts?*

[X] Yes [ ] No

4. If the answer is YES, list the school districts by name and address:

4.1 (Pvt) Charilla Foundation
San Francisco, Ca

4.2 (Pvt) Creative Interracial Educ. Foundation
Berkeley, Ca

4.3 (Pvt) Oaks Children's Center
San Francisco, Ca

4.4 Santa Cruz County Schools
Santa Cruz, Ca

4.5 Dept. of Public Health & Welfare
Community Mental Health Services
San Mateo, Ca

4.6 San Mateo County Schools
Palos Verdes School
San Bruno, Ca

4.7 San Francisco Unified School District
-- Daniel Webster School

4.8 _____
-- Development Center for Handicapped Minors

4.9 _____
-- EH and Pupil Services Personnel

4.10 _____
-- Guidance Service Center

4.11 _____
-- Hidden Valley School

4.12 _____
-- Jedediah Smith School

4.13 _____
-- Le Conte Children's Center

4.14 _____
-- Sunshine School

4.15 San Francisco Community Mental Health Services
San Francisco, Ca

4.16 _____

4.17 _____

4.18 _____

4.19 _____

4.20 _____

Institutions of Higher Learning:
California School of Psychology
Hayward State
San Francisco State
Illinois/Northwestern

* Expansion within the S.F.U.S.D. is also included.

PART II (Continued)

Title III Areas of Influence*

As Project Director and/or after consultation with district or county personnel involved:

1. Name - - - Title - - -
2. Name _____ Title _____
3. Name _____ Title _____

Please rank the impact of this ESEA, Title III project on your local educational agency (LEA). Leave blank any items that do not apply and add other categories as desired. Rank items 1 to 7 (or more if you have made additions to the list). Give examples only on items ranked 1 and 2. Number 1 indicates that throughout the LEA the impact was greatest in developing skill areas or additudinal changes in:

Rank**		Examples
2	Special project development Needs assessment, goal setting, planning (writing), implementation, etc.	Use this space to give examples of items ranked 1 and 2. Special Project Development: Training efforts reulted in D.C.H.M. Seeking to become a training institute. Staff Training: The basic project focus was dissemination and training. Products Developed/Methods: The application of a task analysis approach to curriculum development.
1	Staff training Resulting in added skills or attitudinal change	
3	Parental involvement in the schools Bringing parents into more direct contact with school activities	
---	Community involvement Instances of community participation other than parents	
---	Evaluation competencies and use of evaluation information	
2	Products developed Have the products developed by the project, i.e., Materials: curriculum guides, AV materials, etc. Methods: individualized instructions, use of aides, etc.: been put to use beyond project requirement? List under examples.	
---	Management and accounting procedures Have the project activities resulted in increased accountability in other learning situations? List under examples.	
---	Other - Please explain	

* As a result of participation in ESEA, Title III endeavors

** Information derived will indicate areas of greatest impact - Number 1 most impact Number 7 (or more) least impact.

PART III - EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

1972-1973

The purpose of this part of the report is to find out the actual direct or indirect participation of public and private school pupils and adults in the project during the 1972-73 operational period.

Any participation should be reported only once. The count should be based on actual participation during the 1972-73 school year. The numbers are almost certain to be different from those anticipated in the project application.

The United States Office of Education definitions should be applied:

Direct Participation - Enter the number of different persons participating in activities involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers designed to produce learning, in a classroom, a center or mobile unit; or receiving other special services.

Indirect Participation - Enter the number of different persons visiting or viewing exhibits, demonstrations, museum displays; using materials or equipment developed or purchased by the project; attending performances of plays, symphonies, etc.; viewing television instruction in a school, a center, or home; or participating in other similar activities. Carefully prepared estimates are acceptable.

Elementary - For reporting purposes only, consider elementary as being Prekindergarten through Grade 6.

Secondary - For reporting purposes only, consider secondary as being Grades 7 through 12.

Please supply the information requested for the project.

Table A

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Teachers, and Counselors Participating

Schools (a)	Staff whose students were direct participants				Staff whose students were indirect participants			
	Teachers		Counselors		Teachers		Counselors	
	Elementary (b)	Secondary (c)	Elementary (d)	Secondary (e)	Elementary (f)	Secondary (g)	Elementary (h)	Secondary (i)
Public	71		68		21		18	
Nonpublic	1		0		15		7	

PART III (Continued)

The totals in the following 4 tables must agree one with the other. Also, do not use duplicated figures in the first 4 tables. The target population must be represented by the figures when direct participants are reported. See definitions for direct and indirect in Part III.

Table I

a. Program Select the program of your project. Use "other" category if none apply.	b. Check (✓) program area(s) covered	c. No. of public school students directly participating	d. Amount granted this past year
Reading			
Environment/Ecology			
Equal Educational Opportunity			
Model Cities (Urban, Inner-City)			
Gifted			
Handicapped			
Guidance and Counseling			
Drug Education			
Early Childhood Education (Kindergarten and below)			
Other Programs	✓	- 0 -	50,674
	Total	- 0 -	

Table II

Provide unduplicated counts of students by grade levels. See instructions below:
n/a (adults participated in workshops)

	a. School Enrollment		b. Direct Project Participants		c. Indirect Project Participants		d.	e.
	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic		
Pre K								
K								
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
Ungraded								
TOTALS								

Column a. Include the total enrollment in the local educational agency.
Column b. Include only the target population.
Column b. & c. See definitions of direct and indirect for both columns.
Column d. Include an estimate of the number of target population students who have been in the project since its inception. A cumulative total of all years is requested. Provide an unduplicated count; therefore, do not count any student more than once.
Column e. Include an estimate of the number of students within the local educational agency who have not been directly serviced by the project, but would benefit from direct participation because they fit the description of the target population.

PART III (Continued)

Table III

Rural/Urban Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants Served by Project - Enter Number of Each Category. See definitions at bottom of page.

(Project activity was dissemination and training)

Rural		Metropolitan			Total of all Categories
Farm	Non Farm	Low Socio-Economic	Other	Other Urban	
---	---	121		62	183

Table IV

Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants by Project - Enter Number of Each Group.

Data not available

Negro	American Indian	Spanish Surname	Oriental	White	Other Nonwhite	Total of all groups
						183

Recap of Totals for Tables I, II, III and IV.*

Total of Column c., Table I _____
Total of Column b. (Public School), Table II _____
Total of All Categories, Table III _____
Total of All Groups, Table IV _____

The totals on each line above should agree one with the other.

Definitions:

Rural means an outlying area of less than 2,500 inhabitants.
Low socio-economic means an area of low socio-economic level within a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more.
Other means areas in cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants which are other than low socio-economic areas.
Other Urban means areas (including suburbs) with less than 50,000 but more than 2,500 inhabitants.

* This data is not applicable to the project. Those directly participating in training and workshop sessions were teachers and other school personnel.

Table V n/a

Provide Number of Schools in the Project.

	Public	Nonpublic
Elementary		
Secondary		

Table VI n/a

Number of Students Served Directly by Unique Target Populations (Figures may be duplicated)

Students (a)	Indians (b)	Migrants (c)	Disadvantaged (d)	Handicapped (e)	Childhood Education (Kgtn.& Below) (f)	Other Target Populations (See note below) (g)
Number of Students						

Note for Column (g) check populations included in the number entered above.

_____ Children from non-English speaking environment.

_____ Neglected and delinquent children.

_____ Gifted _____ N.H. _____ EMR _____ Dropouts

_____ Other (specify)_____

Does not apply: This data is not applicable to the project. Those directly participating in training and workshop sessions were teachers and other school personnel.

PART IV - STAFF PARTICIPATION/HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATION

Table VII

Complete the table below as directed. Compute full time equivalent (F.T.E.) according to the instructions under the table.

Paid staff are district personnel who receive remuneration from Title III funds.
Unpaid staff are district personnel who do not receive renumeration from Title III funds but give service to the project.
Ungraded classes are included in Other category.

Type of Paid and Unpaid Personnel By Function	Number of Paid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)	Number of Unpaid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)
Administrators and/or supervisors	.50	.15
Teachers		
Prekindergarten		
Kindergarten		
Other elementary 1-6		3.0
Secondary 7-12		
Other		
Subject matter specialists	.05	
Technicians		
Pupil personnel workers		.50
Health services personnel		.10
Researchers and evaluators		
Planners and developers		
Disseminators	.50	
Other professionals		
Paraprofessional education aides, etc.	3.0	
Other nonprofessional	.63	

To compute full-time equivalent (F.T.E.), add the total number of hours worked per week by the personnel and divide by the number of hours in your regular full-time work week. For example: If each of four staff members works 20 hours per week, each of two staff members works ten hours per week, and each of ten staff members works full time (assume 40 hours for this example), the total hours worked would be 80 plus 20 plus 400, or 500 hours. This total of 500 hours divided by 40 yields an F.T.E. figure of 12.5.

Table VIII

Complete as directed.

Number of consultants paid by Title III funds One
Number of consultant days paid for by Title III funds 4.5

Table IX

Complete as directed for the 1972-73 term.

Number of public school professional staff who attended Title III Inservice:

		Estimate Carefully Title III Funds Spent on Training
Orientation sessions up to one week's duration	58	$ 596.32
Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration	64	$ 523.23
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration	37	$ 1,772.38
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration	---	$ ---
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration	---	$ ---
College credit courses - regular term	14	$ 835.00
College credit courses - summer term	---	$ ---

Number of aides (nonprofessional staff) who attended Title III Inservice:

Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration	4	$ 103.15
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration	7	$ 735.45
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration	---	$
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration	---	$
College credit courses - regular term	---	$
College credit courses - summer term	---	$

NOTE: The Center also provided interships for four graduate students.

PART IV (Continued)

Table X

Complete as directed.

Number of nonpublic school professional staff involved in Title III inservice in the 1972-73 term 16.

Table XI

Enter number of teachers, aides, and students involved in a Title III, 1972, summer school designed to provide instruction to students. None

Grades	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Teachers														
Aides														
Students														

You and/or members of your Project staff may have worked with higher education personnel during the 1972-73 project year (last year). We are interested in the type (formal and informal), and the extent (cost and hours) of any cooperation. Formal participation refers to services performed with remuneration. Informal participation refers to help without remuneration. Please estimate the cost and number of man-days associated with each of the following:

(a) Identifying and/or developing desirable content or educational procedures to be used (program development).
(1) $ 250 cost; (2) number of man-days: 2.5 formal and 3--6 informal

(b) Search for evaluation help, i.e., for instruments or procedures to be used for evaluation.
(1) $ 100 cost; (2) number of man-days: 1 formal and ___ informal

(c) Planning and/or implementing staff development programs (inservice training for project staff).
(1) $ 50 cost; (2) number of man-days: .5 formal and ___ informal

(d) Please indicate any other participation.

_____

_____

(1) $ 420 cost; (2) number of man-days: 3.5 formal and 3--6 informal

PART V - ABSTRACT

GRANTEE

PROJECT ABSTRACTS (ESEA, Title III)	STATE	TOTAL PROJECT PERIOD	FROM (Month and year)	TO (Month and year)	PROJECT NO.
	California		7-1-72	6-30-73	123-1

NOTE: If project involves handicapped children and/or personnel working with handicapped children who are paid from Title III funds, complete the information on the back of this form.

TITLE OF PROJECT		GRANTEE
	Therapeutic Educational Center for Severely Emotionally Disturbed Children (Incentive Grant/Dissemination)	Steven P. Morena

PROJECTED FUNDING LEVEL FOR PROJECT PERIOD	19 72-73 $ 50,674	19 $	19 $	19 $	19 $	19 $

TARGET POPULATION: Professional, paraprofessional, and community persons affiliated/interested in educational programs for severely emotionally disturbed children.

PARAGRAPH DESCRIPTION

Considered an exemplary educational program for severely emotionally disturbed children six through nine years of age, the Therapeutic Educational Center was funded so that the opportunity to become aware of and to possibly adopt the Center program be made available to school districts throughout the State of California.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

To encourage and promote the adoption and adaption of the Therapeutic Educational Center project for severely emotionally disturbed children in a minimum of six other school settings -- districts or schools -- in the State of California.

ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

1. Disseminate information;
2. Operate a model demonstration center;
3. Select school districts;
4. Conduct training seminars;
5. Provide technical assistance.

EVALUATION STRATEGY

The evaluation strategy was developed jointly by the directors of all ESEA Title III Incentive Grant Projects funded in California for the year 1972-73 under the leadership of ESEA Consultant Donald M. Kelly. A common evaluation format was decided upon in order that comparisons could be made between project years, individual projects, etc.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Performance targets were achieved: The Project conducted eighteen workshop/seminars and one or more of the three major project components was adopted in sixteen other school settings.

HANDICAPPED PROJECT PARTICIPATION ONLY - ESEA TITLE III

1. HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED, PERSONNEL PAID, AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED WITH ESEA TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED*	NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED					FULL-TIME EQUIVALENCE OF PROJECT PERSONNEL PAID WITH TITLE III FUNDS				PERSONNEL RECEIVING IN-SERVICE TRAINING WITH TITLE III FUNDS			
	0-5 YEARS	6-12 YEARS	13-18 YEARS	19 & OVER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)
(1) TMR										7	5	3	15
(2) EMR													
(3) HH													
(4) DEAF													
(5) SI													
(6) VI													
(7) ED							3	1.5	4.5	75	7	87	169
(8) CR													
(9) LD													
(10) OHI													
(11) TOTAL										82	12	90	184

n/a

2. NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED WHO ATTEND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

3. DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS n/a

POPULATION	NEGRO	INDIAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	WHITE (Other than Spanish surname)	OTHER	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
Student Participants							

4. CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES - DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREA n/a

CATEGORY	NUMBER
(1) Urban Areas (over 50,000)	
(2) Rural Areas (under 2,500)	
(3) Other Demographic Areas (from 2,500-50,000)	
(4) TOTAL (Sum of lines (1), (2), and (3))	

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **CHILDREN SERVED** – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, and e an unduplicated count of children served by type of primary handicap *(in public and non-public schools)* and by age group who received direct instructional or related services with Title III funds. This count should include all handicapped children *(1)* who received direct services from personnel paid with Title III funds and/or *(2)* who received substantial benefit as a result of the purchase or projects equipment or the provision of significant in-service training of personnel with Title III funds. Do not include handicapped children who received only incidental services, such as preliminary vision screening or audiological testing, etc. Column f should equal columns b, c, d, and e.

   PROJECT PERSONNEL – Enter in the appropriate columns g, h, and i corresponding with the primary type of handicapped children served a figure representing an unduplicated count of the full-time personnel plus the full-time equivalency of part-time personnel paid from Title III funds. Full-time personnel are those personnel who were assigned to Title III project activities 40 hours or more per week *(or the number of hours in a regular work week, as determined by the State or local education agency)*. They may be school year, summer program, or 12-month personnel. Column j should equal columns g, h, and i.

   IN-SERVICE TRAINING – Enter in the appropriate columns k, l, and m corresponding with primary type of handicapped children served an unduplicated count of all personnel who receive in-service training with Title III funds. Column n should equal columns k, l, and m.

2. **NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS** – Of the total number of handicapped children served with Title III funds *(1.(11), (f))*, indicate the number who attended non-public schools.

3. **DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS** – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, e, f, and g an undiplicated count of the handicapped children served with Title III funds by ethnic group membership. Column h should equal columns b, c, d, e, f, and g.

4. **DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREAS** – Self-explanatory.

* TMR = Trainable Mentally Retarded; EMR = Educable Mentally Retarded; HH = Hard of Hearing; SI=Speech Impaired; VI = Visually Impaired; ED = Emotionally Disturbed; CR = Crippled; LD = Learning Disabled; OHI = Other Health Impaired

PART VI - PRODUCTS OF PROJECT

	I Product(s) Developed	II Date mailed to Title III	III Annotations
	Curriculum guides		
	Teacher guides		
✓	Handbooks of materials, techniques, and procedures		
	Monograph		
	Bibliography		
	Questionnaires - locally developed		
	Evaluation tests		
	Audio tape cassettes		
	Brochures, newsletters and information sheets		
	16 mm Films		
	8 mm Films		
	Filmstrips		
	Instructional workbooks, materials, Tests - locally developed		
	Kits		
	Models		
	Microcards		
	Microfilm		
	Maps		
	Pictures		
	Posters		
	Records		
	Set		
✓	Slides/tape		
	Viewmasters		
	Video Tape		
	(Other)_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		

Final Project Report

ESEA, Title III

III

PROGRAM NARRATIVE REPORT

Project No. 123-1
Grant No. 38-68478-01422-1020-2-02
State: California
Final Project Report: July 1, 1972 -- June 30, 1973

CONTEXT

The Locale

1. What is the locale of the program?
2. What is the density of the population?
3. What are the population trends?
4. What are the major occupations of people in the locale?
5. What is the unemployment rate or trend?
6. What proportion of families in the locale are receiving welfare assistance?

Dissemination activities were statewide and involved the entire State of California. The location of the Therapeutic Educational Center, the model operation made available for visitations and demonstrations, was located in San Francisco.

1. The metropolitan community of San Francisco encompasses an area of forty five square miles with a population of 715,674.

2. The density of the population is 15,903.

3. Census figures indicate a high rise in population from 1940 to 1950. From a peak of 775,357 in 1950, population has steadily decreased. The highest exodus occurred between 1960 and 1970 with 24,642 persons leaving the city.

4. Occupational trends indicate a rise in service employment in health care (doctor to orderly) and in the restaurant and hotel industries. There is also an increase in clerical and administrative positions in business and finance. Employment in manufacturing and distribution is steadily declining. It is projected that more land will be converted to commercial development to be utilized for business rather than manufacturing enterprises.

5. The May, 1972 unemployment rate for the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area was 5.7%, a decrease of .4% from April, 1972. Census figures of April, 1970 show a total work force of 318,311 persons in San Francisco. 21,764 persons were without jobs and the unemployment rate was 6.4%.

6. 110,917 persons are receiving welfare monies from the San Francisco Department of Social Service. Of these 20,838 persons are recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The proportion of families receiving welfare assistance is 15.5%.

The School System

1. What grade do the schools serve?
2. How many pupils are there in the school system? How many schools?
3. Are there any significant trends in the school system in enrollment, withdrawal, or transfer?
4. What is the per pupil cost of education in the school system?
5. What is the recent financial history of the school system?

1. The San Francisco Unified School District operates schools from kindergarten through high school level.

2. The district operates 136 schools and the active enrollment of minors and adults is 125,757.

3. In grades K through 12 enrollment has steadily declined from 94,534 in 1967-68 to an estimated 82,100 in the current year. Although population has steadily declined the multiple ethnic mix has increased. The district serves 68.6% minority children and 31.4% Caucasian children with the advent of court ordered busing, many families moved to suburban communities or enrolled their children in private schools. The district is faced with providing educational facilities for a large percentage of minority students many of whom have difficulties speaking English. The percentage of minority children served will probably increase while Caucasian enrollment will continue to decline.

4. In grades K through 12 the estimated pre pupil cost of education for 1971-72 is $1500.00. This is an increase of $87.00 from the previous years of $1413.00.

5. The financial status of the district is precarious. It has been beset by inflation, pressure for salary increases and fringe benefits from both teaching and non-teaching personnel. Court ordered busing has greatly added to district expense. Its last bond issue was defeated. The general community feeling seems to be that although the district spend a large sum on each child, quality education is lacking. It is doubtful that any future bond issue will be approved until the voters have more assurance regarding the quality of education in district schools.

Needs Assessment

1. What was the starting point for needs assessment?
2. How were the specific needs of the pupils identified?
3. What were these specific needs? Which were selected for the program?

1. From 1969-1972 as an ESEA Title III project, the Therapeutic Educational Center demonstrated its effectiveness as an educational program for severely emotionally disturbed children and at the end of project funding the San Francisco Unified School District continued the program. Simultaneously at the state level the need for the development and expansion of educational programs for this pupil population was identified by the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education and the State Department of Health's Mental Health Services division.

2. The project's purpose was to make available a model operation for visitation to demonstrate educational methods as well as the operation of a self contained educational program for severely disturbed children. In addition, staff was made available to undertake the training of other School personnel who were interested in adapting the program. After activities which were directed toward creating an awareness of the Center's program and the availability of its demonstration and training resources, school people were "self-selected" in the sense that they took the next step in requesting service.

3. The project staff selected three major components that they considered areas in which they had developed an expertise. They were: Planning for the administration and operation of a program for severely emotionally disturbed children; instructional methods used to teach academic and social skills; and methods used in working with parents and other Community Agencies. It was felt that these three areas would meet most of the specific needs of potential adapters.

Historical Background

1. Did the program exist prior to the time period covered in the present report?
2. Is the program a modification of a previously existing program?
3. How did the program originate?
4. If special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents and the community, how were these solved so that the program could be introduced?
5. Provide a brief history of planning. Indicate which planning efforts were successful or were not successful. Describe how non-profit private schools and other agencies were involved in the planning.

1. Visitation and the dissemination of information were included in the Therapeutic Educational Center's operation since its inception; however, these were not formalized nor were the awareness aspects of this project's activity a part of prior years.

2. Dissemination activities were modeled on a format previously developed and used by ESEA Title III dissemination projects and State Department Consultant Donald M. Kelly. The Center's training activities were unique and insofar as possible included the collaboration of trainer and trainee in the actual classroom situation.

3. n/a

4. It appeared that parents and the Community were more often accepting of the need for special educational programs for the severely disturbed than are school district personnel who are frequently loathe to extend their programming into this very expensive and relatively new area. The major problems in other schools adapting the program was first their recognition and acceptance of responsibility to provide such a program and the second was adequate financing.

5. n/a

PROGRAM

Scope of the Program

1. What numbers and kinds of participants were served by the program?
2. What were the specified objectives of the program?

1. The project served professional and paraprofessional educators who were publicly and privately affiliated as well as other community persons interested in developing school programs for severely emotionally disturbed children from six through twelve years of age. Its diffusion activities included:

PHASE I - Awareness

314	Participants at ACSA/EXPO Traveling Seminar
149	Participants in other presentations
186	Recipients of written materials

PHASE II - Visitation/Demonstration

9	Visitation demonstrations
148	Visitors/observers at T.E.C.

PHASE III - Training of Adapters

18	Seminars
67	Number of Sessions
267-277	Participants

2. Project Objectives: To encourage and promote the adoption and adaption of the Therapeutic Educational Center project for severely emotionally disturbed children in a minimum of six other school settings -- districts or schools -- in the state of California.

Personnel

1. What kinds and numbers of personnel were added by the program?
2. What were their most important duties and activities?
3. How much time did each type of personnel devote to these responsibilities?
4. What special qualifications suited personnel to the requirements of their jobs?
5. What special problems were dealt with in recruiting or maintaining staff?

1. The project provided one full time director who carried the major responsibility for dissemination and training functions and one half time typist-clerk. Three paraprofessionals were provided as a trade-off for the teacher-trainer that conducted training sessions and assisted in the management of the model operation.

2. See above.

3. The director spent three-fourths of the time in activities related to dissemination and training. The remaining one-fourth was spent in administration and liaison activities related to the operation of the Center as a San Francisco School district program.

The typist-clerk was occupied in an approximately equal split between the Model Center operation and the remaining dissemination activities.

The teacher-trainer worked about three-fourths of the time in training and staff supervisory activities; the other one-fourth of the time was spent in management of the Model Center.

The three paraprofessionals worked full time in the school operation and made for a full complement of staff.

4. All the personnel assigned dissemination and training responsibilities had been with the Center since it began operation and thus were ideally qualified for their project assignments.

5. There were no special problems in recruiting/maintaining the staff assigned to dissemination and training. There were problems related to staff who manned the model operation: Two of three paraprofessionals and one of three teachers were new to the program. The director had no choice in the selection of the paraprofessionals - these were civil service positions filled on the basis of the rule of one (i.e., the first person on the list gets the job). New staff had to be trained and this took a large portion of the teacher-trainer's time during the beginning of the 1972-1973 year. It also meant that the staff was less competent and capable of working as a team initially.

Organizational Details

1. What is the period of time covered by your report?
2. How much of the entire program does this cover?
3. Where were program activities located?
4. What special physical arrangements were used in these locations?
5. What provisions, if any, were made for periodic review of the program?
6. What important decisions were made on the basis of such reviews?
7. What provisions, if any, were made for inservice training?

1. The report covers a one year time period from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973.

2. This covers the entire operation of the program.

3. The project activities were headquartered at the Therapeutic Educational Center and the entire facility was used for demonstration/observation. Some training activities took place at the Center sometime during, but primarily after, school hours. Although the state of California was the assigned boundary for diffusion and training, the majority of project activity took place in other programs operated by the San Francisco Unified School District and other districts adjacent to or very near the bay area.

4. No special physical arrangements were used (or required) in the various locations where training took place.

5. E.S.E.A. Title III Consultant Donald M. Kelly scheduled initial, periodic, and terminal reviews of the diffusion activities.

6. Awareness programming, project objectives and evaluation formats, budget re-negotiations, and reporting procedures and forms were all decisions made on the basis of periodic reviews. An especially helpful method was the collective discussion and decision making that all Title III diffusion project directors participated in together with state department staff.

7. The teacher-trainer was responsible for Center staff inservice training as a part of the model operation. In a broader sense the very purpose of the project was training, including inservice training for other staff, in which all center personnel participated for varying amounts of time.

Activities or Services

1. What were the main activities (or services) in the program?
2. How were these activities (or services) related to specified program objectives?
3. What methods were used in carrying out each activity (or service)?
4. What was a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for the children (or others) who received the program?
5. How were pupils grouped for the various program activities?
6. What were teacher-pupil ratios (or aid-pupil, or adult-pupil, and so on) in each of these groupings?
7. How did pupils (or others) receive feedback on their individual daily progress?
8. How did parents receive feedback on their child's progress?
9. What amounts and kinds of practice, review, and quiz activities were provided for pupils (or others) in the program?
10. What special provisions were made for motivating pupils (or others)?
11. If a comparison group was used, what were important differences in the activities and methods used in this group and the activities and methods used with the program group?

1 and 2. The program's main activities in relation to program objectives were:

Objective 1.0 DISSEMINATE information at the awareness level

Activities:

- 1.1 Prepare, duplicate/print, and distribute brochures, and evaluation summaries pertaining to program/project operation
- 1.2 Conduct informational seminars, workshops, and lectures

Objective 2.0 OPERATE A MODEL DEMONSTRATION CENTER for the 1972-1973 school year

Activities:

- 2.1 Recruit and employ personnel
- 2.2 Staff and train a full staff complement for a model operation
- 2.3 Prepare and duplicate/print hand-out materials
- 2.4 [Provide for] operational costs
- 2.5 Schedule, conduct visitations and interpret program to observers of the model project operation

Objective 3.0 SELECT districts and schools interested in adopting/adapting one or more of the three major project components: (1) The administration and operation of a program for severely emotionally disturbed children; (2) Instructional methods used to teach academic and social skills; and (3) Methods used in working with parents and other community agencies.

Activities:

3.1 Provide CONSULTATION to districts who are initiating activities to stimulate support/interest in project adoption.

3.2 Establish criteria and compile list of district's expressing interest.

3.3 Select district's meeting criteria.

Objective 4.0 CONDUCT TRAINING seminars for potential adopting/adapting districts or schools

Activities:

4.1 Observe operation in potential adopting/adapting district.

4.2 Identify strengths, limits and constraints in each district.

4.3 Collaborate with personnel in adopting/adapting district to select content area, i.e., one or both of the two major project components, for training.

4.4 Collaborate with personnel in adopting/adapting district to plan location and time frame for training sequence.

4.5 Conduct training seminars.

Objective 5.0 PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE to all adopting/adapting districts or schools as required

Activities:

5.1 Provide consultation to adopting/adapting district in initiating phase by means of personal service of a direct nature and/or referral to other sources for information.

5.2 Render technical assistance to installed program in adopting/adapting district.

Objective 6.0 EVALUATE the diffusion process

Activities:

6.1 Collect and comparatively analyze data for each of the five above functional objectives.

6.2 Prepare a brief collective account of evaluation findings.

3. The methods used to carry out diffusion activities included: lecture, panel, slide, and slide-tape presentations. Observers were scheduled to visit the Center two days each week in groups of no more than six persons; the program was interpreted, observations of all activities followed and next staff met with the visitors to answer questions. The average observation took two and a half hours. Staff training methods varied considerably; however, the attempt was to work with the trainees in their school and classroom milieu whenever possible. One of the methods employed that proved effective was a task analysis approach to developing individualized curriculum.

4. n/a

5. n/a

6. Trainer/trainee ratios ranged from one-to-one to one-to-fifty. The median ratio was five-to-one.

7. The trainees received feedback from the training staff on their progress. The learning by doing approach also encouraged self assessment.

8. n/a

9. The approach in the one training effort developed to provide participants with College Credit included written examinations. Content review was a part of the trainer's method. The Center was used as a laboratory and the trainees practiced taking data and giving instruction using methods based on Learning Theory.

Other training sessions were less formalized and did not use pre- and post-testing; rather, they resulted in a "product" i.e., a piece of curriculum, adopting a specific teaching method, revising a classroom schedule, etc.

10. n/a

11. n/a

Instructional Equipment and Materials

1. Were special materials developed or adapted for the program? How and by whom?
2. What other major items of equipment and materials did the program require? In what amounts?
3. How were key aids and materials used in connection with the various program activities?
4. If a comparison is being made between program and nonprogram persons, were there important differences between these groups in kinds and amounts of materials provided, or in methods of use?

1. Special materials used in the program were developed by the project director, teacher-trainer, and the Center social worker. Brochures and cards were designed. An information packet was compiled which consisted of a program abstract, the article "A Functional Definition of Severe Emotional Disturbance Using Observed Behaviors, a Behavior Rating Check List", one sample program schedule, and staff meeting notes (to illustrate their content). Seven operational aspects of the program were developed in outline form. The format used for the task analysis approach that was applied in some of the training was an adaptation of the activity program budgeting format used in E.S.E.A. Title III project proposals. Other sundry materials were developed for specific application in particular workshops or seminars as required.

2. The project had available to it all the resources of the Therapeutic Educational Center including the slide tape that was used in awareness and training activities. The project was service oriented so that the major needs were for personnel rather than equipment and materials.

3. See response to question one above.

4. n/a

Instructional (i.e. dissemination and training) Materials

Supply and Printing Costs *

$ 233.00	Brochures (4,000)
25.55	Business Cards (1,000)
48.11	Slides, film and processing
128.50	Project Report (100)
246.58	Project Evaluation Report (100)
115.00	Pupil Social Behavior Check List
101.24	Informational Packet/seven enclosures (200 packets)
4.87	Display Board
$ 902.85	- Total

* This excludes ditto prepared materials.

Parent-Community Involvement

1. What role, if any, did parents have in the program?
2. Were meetings held with parents? Why? How often?
3. What role, if any, did various community groups have in the program?
4. How was the community kept informed?
5. If problems with parents or the community affected the program, what steps, if any, were taken to remedy the situation?

1. n/a

2. n/a

3. The members of the mental health professional community availed themselves of the technical assistance and workshop services that the project offered. Although the training aspects of the project were not geared to parents and the lay community, awareness presentations were made to the State P.T.A., parents observed at the Center, and information about the program was presented to all parent and volunteer groups so requesting.

4. See response to question 3 above. In addition, the E.S.E.A. Title III state offices wrote and issued press releases throughout California for the AGSA/EXPO seminars and for other major presentations.

5. n/a

Budget

1. From what sources were program funds obtained?
2. What was the total cost of the program?
3. What period of time was covered by these funds?
4. What is the per pupil cost of the program? What was the formula for computing this figure?
5. How does the per pupil cost of the program compare with the normal per pupil cost of the schools in the program?
6. Where can the reader get more detailed budget information?
7. Of the total cost of the program, give rough dollar estimates of developmental costs, implementation costs and operational costs.
8. Give the costs for the entire project period by budget categories (i.e., professional salaries, contracted services, etc.).

1. The diffusion project was financed by an E.S.E.A. Title III grant of $50,674. This was in addition to $90,559 funding by the San Francisco Unified School District used to operate the Center.

2. The total cost of the project was $50,674.

3. Time period covered: July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973.

4. n/a

5. n/a

6. Martin Dean, Assistant Superintendent
   Special Educational Services Division
   San Francisco Unified School District
   135 Van Ness Avenue
   San Francisco, California 94102

7. Developmental Costs: $50,674
   Implementation Costs: $ 8,266
   Operational Costs: $42,408

8. Costs for project period by budget categories:

$ 23,925	Salaries, professional
20,434	Salaries, non-professional
574	Contracted Services
3,380	Materials and Supplies
1,700	Travel
0	Equipment
600	Other

Special Factors

For use of potential adopters of the program:

1. What modifications of the program are possible?
2. What are the suggested steps in adopting this program?
3. What are some things others should avoid in adopting this program?
4. Can the program be phased in, beginning on a small scale? How?
5. Can parts of the program be adopted without taking the whole program? What parts?

Although the project per se was one of disseminating information about the Center and helping other schools to adapt the program, these questions are answered in relation to the Center operation and its methodology:

1. Modifications that do not effect essential programming and that would reduce costs are possible: (a) A self contained setting is required but it could be in a school owned property or collaborating mental health facility. (b) The ratio of credentialed teachers to teaching assistants could be reduced with the teacher assuming more planning and supervisory and less teaching functions. (c) Some part of the transportation could be provided by parents. (d) The program could be established to serve several districts based on a county or regional basis.

2. The suggested steps in adopting this program: (a) Commitment from the administrative staff of the district/districts special education division; (b) Assessment of need in relation to existing local, regional, and state services and their projections for expansion/reduction of program; (c) Involvement of the educational and mental health communities (with other community participation insofar as possible) in collaborating on the design to meet the needs of that particular area and to provide an undergirding of community support for the program; (d) Adaption of the operational design; (e) Presentation of the need and recommended program to the necessary boards of education for approval.

3. The danger in adopting the program lies in its potential to be perceived as a competing rather than a cooperating service by other district special educational programs as well as community hospitals and clinics that are providing a similar program.

It is not advisable to have enrollment criteria include a psychiatric diagnosis as a mandatory provision. An assessment of a child's functioning as it relates to school performance, social and academic, is recommended.

The program's administrative ties will influence the degree to which it is an educational program. If its first level administrator is school district staff it is more likely to maintain its educational focus.

4. Components two and three relating to method and parent/community involvement allow the operation to be adapted in part and on a small scale.

5. The program's methods that are based on learning theory principles can be adopted to any school situation. The program as an operation for severely emotionally disturbed children who require a self contained setting is less adaptable by definition.

Dissemination

Discuss how project information was disseminated during the past budget period.

1. Provide an estimate of the number of unsolicited requests for information from both within and outside the project area.
2. List the number of visitors from outside the project area.
3. Provide the cost of dissemination during the last budget period.
4. Provide the total cost of dissemination including perior budget periods (if possible).

1. Unsolicited Requests for Information

   186 within project area (California
   6 Outside project area

2. Number of visitors from outside project area: 3 of 148

3. Cost of dissemination during last budget period: $50,674

4. n/a

Evaluation Narrative

Summary Report of Diffusion Activities

AWARENESS

314 . Number of participants at ACSA/EXPO traveling seminar

149 . Number of participants (6 presentations) in addition to ACSA/EXPO

1,155 . Number of materials sent from project (in and out State)

186 . Number of individuals receiving materials sent from TEC

3 . Other awareness activities

Visitation and Demonstration
Off-Site

9 . Number of visitations and demonstrations

148 . Total number of on-site observers

Training of Adaptors

18 . Number of separate workshops, seminars

67 . Number of Sessions

267 - 277 . Number of participants

Adoption/Adaption of Program Components

4 . Administration and operation of a program for severely emotionally disturbed children

16 . Instructional methods used to teach academic and social skills

6 . Methods used in working with parents and other community agencies

Number of Adaption/Adoption Schools and Programs (20 Total)

11 . Public Schools

3 . Private Schools and Institutions

3 . Institutions of Higher Learning

3 . Others

Interim Objectives and Findings

1. What were the interim objectives of the program?
2. State the findings in ordinary language for each objective.
3. Indicate clearly success or failure for each objective
4. Can the findings be generalized, or are they applicable only to the group served by the program?
5. What were the causative factors for unmet objectives?
6. What are the other important findings which were not anticipated?

Interim Objective	Evaluation Criteria	Project Results	Met Criteria (Yes/No)
1.0 Dissemination Information distribution	Minimum distribution to 1,000 school district personnel, other community agency representatives and interested citizens	Distributed: 631 mailings + 763 handouts 1,394 Total	Yes
Informational seminars, workshops and lectures	Minimum conducting of 20 informational seminars, workshops and lectures	Conducted: 20	Yes
Observations	Minimum observation of Center operation by 200 persons	Observers: 20	No
2.0 Operate Model Center	As attested to by a review of project/District records and visitation of ESEA personnel	The Center was operated for 1972-1973 school year	Yes
	That sixty-three per cent of observers evaluate the Center operation as better than average and twenty per cent as exemplary	Incomplete data	---
3.0 Selection	That eighty-five of the districts and schools rated as high potential adapters proceed to the next step of the process, i.e. participation in staff training	Nineteen of the twenty-three schools initiating specific inquiries regarding staff training proceeded to the next step in the process. This is eighty-two per cent	n/a
4.0 Conduct Training	Conduct training for a minimum of six districts and schools	Training conducted for eighteen districts and schools	Yes
5.0 Provide Technical assistance	As requested by adapting/adopting districts	22 schools requested and were given technical assistance: 10 in planning phase 4 to revise on-going programs 8 in relation to adapting one or more project components.	Yes

Dissemination -- awareness level -- activities were less than anticipated. The small physical plant with only three classrooms made it necessary for the Center to limit the number of observers; in addition visitation did not begin until some five weeks after the school year began. This was due to staff turnover and the need to recruit and train new personnel. Incomplete data was collected in regard to observer evaluations. Those that were gathered rated the Center visitation from 8 to 10 on a scale of 10. Unfortunately, the staff who were assigned to obtain the evaluations did not follow through.

It was not necessary to formalize the selection process. A total of twenty-three specific inquiries were made and nineteen of these proceeded to the training phase. It would seem that when potential adapters made specific inquiries regarding training they were already primed to go. Of the four inquiries that did not result in training, three were made by teachers without administrative sanction at that time.

The interest in the training/technical assistance aspects of the project gained impetus in May-June. Three districts asked for service and it was necessary to refuse them. Were it feasible the project year would better be operated from January through December.

Project Objectives and Findings

1. What were the project objectives of the program?
2. State the findings in ordinary language for each objective.
3. Indicate clearly success or failure for each objective.
4. Can the findings be generalized, or are they applicable only to the group served by the program?
5. What were the causative factors for umet objectives?
6. What are the other important findings which were not anticipated?

1. There was one major project objective:

   To encourage and promote the adoption and adaption of the Therapeutic Educational Center project for severely emotionally disturbed children in a minimum of six other school settings -- districts or schools -- in the state of California.

2. One or more of the three project components were adopted/adapted in eighteen different school settings. There were four adoption/adaptions of the operational component, fifteen of the methodology, and six of the parent/community.

3. The project objective was achieved.

4. n/a

5. n/a

6. Adaption/adoptions were made in -

   9 Public school settings
   3 Private schools
   3 Institutions of Higher Learning
   3 Other community institutions

The Diffusion Process Summary – Phase 1: Awareness

	Initial Awareness			Secondary Awareness							
	Source			number of programs	Participants						
					Staff Positions Known to be Represented per Contact						Total Known number of participants
	ACSA / EXPO	District Mailing	Other		A	T	S	P	A/s	x	
Total	71	4	56	7	3	5	2	1	3	1	75
Public School Districts	69	4	30	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	26
Private Schools and Institutions	1	0	7	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	x
Institutions of Higher Learning	0	0	9	3	0	2	2	0	1	1	49
Other	1	0	10	1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

The Diffusion Process Summary - Phase 2: Mailings, Visits, and Demonstrations.

	Materials and Documents			Number of Observers of Program and/or Demonstrations
	Total Documents Distributed	Number of Information Packets	Other	
Total	815	93	164	148
Public School Districts	743	87	134	71
Private Schools and Institutions	12	1	5	21
Institutions of Higher Learning	1	0	1	40
Other	59	5	24	16

The Diffusion Process Summary - Phase 4: Staff Training

	Number of Workshops, Sessions, and Participants		
	Workshops/Seminars	Sessions	Participants
Total	18	67	267-277
Public School Districts	11	49	180-190
Private Schools and Institutions	2	15	35
Institutions of Higher Learning	2*	2	36
Other	3	1	16

* plus three educational internships

The Diffusion Process Summary - Phase 5: Technical Assistance for Implementation

	Number of Contacts			Staff Positions Known to be Represented Per Contact						Number of Participants (Adapting School/ Agency)
	Monitor	Other Technical Assistance	Total	A	T	S	P	A/S	O	
Total	7	50	57	15	13	6	2	9	2	81-86
Public School Districts	7	27	34	8	12	5	2	4	2	62-67
Private Schools and Institutions	0	13	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Institutions of Higher Learning	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Other	0	9	9	6	1	0	0	4	0	16

Estimated Investment of The Project and Consumer Schools for Adaption/Adoption Schools and Agencies				
Summary				
	Project		Consumer School/ Agency	
	Professional Time (Hours)	Estimated Costs	Estimated Costs	Number of Staff Involved
Total	426.890	5719.40	6151.05	202
Public School Districts	260.390	4064.24	5116.96	151
Private Schools and Institutions	105.500	1026.05	412.00	26
Institutions of Higher Learning	51.500	421.55	0	3
Others	9.500	207.56	622.15	22

Details				
	Hours	Costs	Costs	Number
Public School Districts				
Total	260.390	4064.24	5116,90	151
* Modesto City	1.285	20.86	170.70	3
San Francisco: Daniel Webster	4.500	58.65	0.00	2
D.C.H.M.	119.000	1624.00	1,242.60	15
Hidden Valley	14.000	78.32	0.00	5
G.S.C.	8.000	699.48	108.00	2
Jed. Smith	4.5000	40.50	0.00	2
Le Conte	20.000	388.25	0.00	7
Pupil Services ⓓ	19.000	258.40	323.80	50 est.
Pupil Services ⓔ	37.000	495.60	1,790.80	20
Sunshine	2.000	18.00	0.00	2
San Mateo County	15.037	155.06	1,151.00	40 est.
Santa Cruz	16.070	227.12	330.00	3
Private Schools and Institutions				
Total	105.500	1026.05	412.00	26
* Charilla	2.500	14.25	117.00	4
C.I.E.	90.000	835.00	295.00	15
Oaks	13.000	176.80	0.00	7
Institutions of Higher Learning				
Total	51.500	421.55	0.00	3
* Calif. School Psychology	1.500	8.55	0.00	1
Hayward State	20.000	165.00	unknown	1
S.F. State	30.000	248.00	unknown	1
Others				
Total	9.500	207.56	622.15	22
*S.F. Comm. Men. Health	1.500	22.15	47.85	2
S.M. Comm. Men. Health	4.000	143.10	535.92	19
Illinois/Northwestern	4.000	42.31	38.38	1

* were not in training per se, but received technical assistance.

ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES OF THE THERAPEUTIC EDUCATIONAL CENTER PROJECT
1972-1973

Records were maintained on any contact that was (1) a request for additional information following an awareness presentation and/or any written or personal contact made to the project directly. Producer costs, i.e. costs to the project, were based on actual salaries paid and time spent. Consumer school costs, i. e. costs to the adopting/adapting institution, were based on the average California teacher's salary ($12,091.); ten percent was added in computing the costs of administrative positions.

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
1. Albany Unified - Albany Middle Annette Allen, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	-	---	---	---
2. Alhambra, Cen. Ofc. Bruce Peppin, Dir.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
3. Alum Rock, Linda Vista School Mrs. Donald Balcom, Par.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
4. Apple Valley Cen. Ofc. James Woody, Supt.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
5. Arcadia Baldwin Stocker Sally Jess, Tchr. Dana Erin Voudin, Tchr. First Avenue Elementary Anne W. Botwin, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
6. Arcata Cen. Ofc. Antoinette Martin, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
7. Auburn Union Alta Vista Ginna Akers, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
8. Beardsley Cen. Ofc. Chas. F. Nelson, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---
9. Beaumont Unified Cen. Ofc. J.L. Lucas, Supt.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0											
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T A S P O A S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P. (3)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.105	0	0	3.18	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1:0

● Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
10. Berryessa Union Cen.Ofc. Lee Buchanan, Dir.	0	0	0	---	✓	---	---	---	---
11. Burlingame Cen. Ofc. Betty Braunsteen, Psy.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
12. Campbell Unified Lynhaven School Kathryn Merry, Prin. ● Sherman Oaks Adrian Cibilich, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
13. Davis Joint Unified Davis Jr. High Alice Leggett, Tchr. Davis Sr. High Lynn Dal Parto, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
14. Del Paso Heights Cen. Ofc. Carolyn Minor, Dir.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
15. Desert Sands Unified Cen. Ofc. Joseph L. Linn, Asst. Supt. Desert Sands High School Alex Alexander, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
16. Downey Unified Cen. Ofc. Jerry Thornton, Coor Rancho Hospital School Bill Ingram, Prin. ● George Bullock, Psy.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
17. Earlimart Earlimart Jr. High Milton Woolsey, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P. (3)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.105	0	0	3.18	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
18. Eureka City - High School Cen. Ofc. Doris Agin, Psy. Eureka Union greenhills School Ronald G. Walker, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
19. Exeter Union Cen. Ofc. Phil Kearney, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
20. Fairfield - Suisun Cen. Ofc. Percy Haugen, Coor. Jane Croke, Psy Joe Hendhorn, Psy. Donna Stringall, Psy.	x	x	x	✓	---	---	---	---	---
21. Farmersville Cen. Ofc. Bob T. Ellers, Dir.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
22. Fontana Fontana Adult School A.J. Willoit, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
23. Fountain Valley Bd. of Ed. Mary Hix, Bd. Mbr. Cen. Ofc. Marie Otto, Psy.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
24. Fowler Unified Malaga School John Pereira	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---

	2.0		4.0		5.0										
	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	4/9	1	---	---	---	---	---		.390	0	0	9.94	visit: 107.	1	0
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: | 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	Component	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0 1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
25. Fresno Unified Cen. Ofc. Dick Kisling, Dir. Bob Force, Coor. Scandinavian School Beatrice Woof, Tchr. T.R. Heaton Richard Asadoorian, Dir.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
26. Hacienda La Puente Cen Ofc. Bill Sandison, Dir.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
27. Hanford Earl F. Johnson High Don Null, Prin.		0	0	0	---	✓	---	---	---	---
28. Hueneme Cen. Ofc. V. G. Johnson, Asst. Supt.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
29. Humbolt Co. Schools Cen. Ofc. Marilyn Miles		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
30. Jefferson Elementary (Cross Refence: other/San Mateo Co. Community Mental Health) Cen. Ofc. Lowell Jennings, Dir. Westlake School Barbara Brown, Tchr		x	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
31. John Swett Unified Cen Ofc. Mary Malon, Dir.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
32. Kings Co. Schools Cen. Ofc. Edwin A. Curts, Psy. Ann Eagerly, Psy		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0											
	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: S T A/S A O P	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
I.P. (4)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.140	0	0	4.24	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P. + 1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.285	0	0	4.03	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
2	---	---	---	---	---	A T O	4	1/24 1/29	6.0	1 hr.	2.20	83.80	120.58	2	0	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x	

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

Therapeutic Educational Center

1.0

Public School Districts	Component	1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	INITIAL AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	INITIAL AWARENESS: OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	SECONDARY AWARENESS: A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE
	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0	0.0								
33. Lemoore Union High Cen. Ofc. Allen Gilkey, Asst. Supt.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
34. Los Angeles City Unified Cen. Ofc. Bob J. McKee, Speech & Hrg. Mc Bride School S. W. Mangen, Prin. Jeanne Clifton, Parent Oakdale Elementary Sonia Guravitz, Tchr. Salvin Rose Engel, Prin. Woodland Hills Frances Bilaire, Tchr. Nobel Jr. High Metropolitan High W.B. Hansen, Prin.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
35. Los Angeles County Schools Paul B. Baum, Prin.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
36. Los Altos Cen. Ofc. John L. Yale, Coor.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
37. Menlo Park Cen. Ofc. Pat Morrissey, Coor.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
38. Millbrae Helen Meadows Elementary Richard Anderson		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE / DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (6)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.210	0	0	6.36	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	Component	1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	INITIAL AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	INITIAL AWARENESS: OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	SECONDARY AWARENESS: A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE
	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0									
39. Modesto City Schools Cen. Ofc. L. J. Clark, Adm. Jerrold Fry, Dir. Judy McArthur, Soc. Wkr. Tom Sawyer, Citizen		0	0	AA	✓	---	✓	---	---	---
40. Mojave Unified Cen. Ofc. A. Byron Westlake, Dir. Arlo Sturgeon, Psy.		x	x	x	✓	---	---	---	---	---
41. Morgan Hill Unified Walsh School John Carpenter, Tchr. B. Sansome, Tchr		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
42. Napa Valley Unified Cen. Ofc. Westley V. St. John, Adm.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
43. Newport-Mesa Unified Pomona Ralph Freitag, Prin.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
44. New Haven Unified Alvarado High Bill Boyle, Counselor James Logan High August Scornaiechi		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
45. Ocean View Mesa View School Rita Jett, Dir.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
46. Oakland Unified		x	x	x	---	---	✓	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A P S T O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P. +2	12/5	3	---	---	---	---		---	1.285	0	0	20.86	170.70	3	0
I.P.	1/5	1	---	---	---	---		---	.755	0	0	13.56	167.00	1	0
I.P.	2/5	1	---	---	---	---		---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. +2	---	---	---	---	---	---		---	.285	0	0	8.36	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---		---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---		---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P. +1	---	---	---	---	---	---		---	.135	0	0	2.42	x	x	x
I.P.	5/31	1	---	---	---	---		---	.25	0	0	5.70	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

● Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	Component	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
		1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
47. Ontario - Montclair Board Rose B. Kelber Berlyn Ave. Irene Nugent		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
48. Oroville Union High Las Plumas High School K. Monday, Tchr. Carl Nelson		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
49. ● Palm Springs Unified Cen. Ofc. F. Wayland Reynolds, Dir.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
50. Palo Alto Escondido Louis W. Parente, Prin.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
51. Pomona Unified Niel Armstrong School Alma Rogers, Tchr. Roosevelt R.E. Richardson, Tchr.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
52. Redwood City Schools Cen. Ofc. Judy Kirk, Soc. Wkr. --- Myrna Kirk, Tchr.		x	x	x	---	---	✓	---	---	---
53. Rialto Unified Education Center Marilyn Miller, Dir.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
54. ● Richmond Unified Cen. Ofc. Edwin V. La Place, Asst. Supt. Martin Luther King Jr. Elem Ina Briggs, Prin. Barbara Janasse, Tchr.		0	0	0	✓	---	✓	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
MATERIALS S[illegible]: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUME	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
---	5/22	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	.25	0	0	5.70	140.00	2	0
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
[illegible]	5/22	17	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.035	0 1.25 hrs	0 4.00	93.06	x	17	0

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts

ADOPTION AO
ADAPTION AA
UNCERTAIN X
NO 0
0.0

Component	1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	INITIAL AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	INITIAL AWARENESS: OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	SECONDARY AWARENESS: A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE
55. Roseville City Elementary Cen. Ofc. Leon. Geisler, Psy	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
56. Sacramento County Schools Childrens' Ctr. of Sacto. Jesse Furukawa, Dir. Joe Cunha, Consultant (St. Dept.)	0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
57. Sacramento Unified Cen. Ofc. Elvie C. Watts, Coor. Newton Booth School George Eager, T.A. Theodore Judah Carl Wilson, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
58. San Bernadino County Cen. Ofc. Jeanne Davis, Cons.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
59. San Bruno Park Cen. Ofc. W.D. Miller, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
60. San Diego County Cen. Ofc. Clayton L. Bennett Dorothy Davis Tchr. Louise Bookbinder, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
61. San Dieguito Union High Cen. Ofc. Robert A. Morton, Asst. Supt.	0	0	0	---	✓	---	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
4	2/16 2/27	2 2	---	---	---	A	2	2/16	17.40	0	0	23.40	321.40	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.05	0	0	3.18	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. (3)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.05	0	0	3.18	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
62. San Francisco Unified									
Columbus Elementary Margaret Foster, Tchr.	X	X	X	---	---	✓	--	---	---
Daniel Webster Elaine Pappas, Tchr. Patty Moran, T.A.	AA	AA	O	---	---	✓	--	---	---
Developmental Center for Handicapped Minors. Henry Caruso, Dir.	O	AA	O	---	---	✓	4/17	T P A A/S	14
Hidden Valley Jack Wallace, Tchr.	O	AA	O	---	---	✓	--	---	---
Dudley Stone Barbara Raff, Tchr.	O	O	O	---	---	✓	--	---	---
Farragut Gersten Rosenberg, Prin.	O	O	O	---	---	✓	1/10	A T	12
Glen Park Mary Applin, Tchr.	X	X	X	---	---	✓	--	---	---
Guidance Service Ctr. Joan Curtis, Psy.	O	AA	X	---	---	✓	--	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0											
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A P / T O / S A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
---	2/11	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	.25	0	0	5.70	33.50	1	0
2	3/15 3/20 3/26 4/9	1 1 1 1	3/20	2	3/22 4/9 4/12	T TS TS	1 2 2	3/22 4/9 4/12	1.5 1.5 1.5	.25 .25 .25	.66 .66 .66	58.65	0	1 2	10 10
0 ●	---	---	4/2 3 4 5 6 25 5/8 9 11 14 16 18 22 6/13	15 -to- 20	---	A T S P A/S	15 -to- 20 4	4/2 3 4 5 6 25 5/8 9 11 14 16 18 22 6/13 5/31	119.	3.5	11.20	1,624.	1,242.60	15	80
4	---	---	3/13 3/29	5	3/29	T	4	3/29	7. 7.	3 hrs. 3 hrs.	11.82 11.82	78.32 78.32	0	5	35
---	11/16	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	5.70	0	0	5.70	0	2	0
2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3.	.25	.50	41.30	0	12	0
---	5/18	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	.25	0	0	5.70	33.50	1	0
●	10/8	4	2/22 3/1 3/8 3/15 3/22 3/29 4/5 4/12	2	---	---	---	---	8 hrs.	.6	2.24	699.48	108.00	2	0

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	Component	1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	INITIAL AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	INITIAL AWARENESS: OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	SECONDARY AWARENESS: A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE
	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0	0.0								
62. San Francisco (Cont'd)										
Jedediah Smith Edna Driver, Tchr. Hira Khan, Tchr.		0	AA	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
Le Conte Children's Ctr. Fern Jansen, Dir.		0	AA	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
Paul Revere Anna Shratzuki, Tchr.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
Programs for the Educationally Handicapped Marguerite Dugger, Supr.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
Pupil Services Personnel Joyce Kohfeldt, Dir.		0	AA	AA	---	---	✓	---	---	---
Research Teaching Project Joyce Kohfeldt, Dir.		0	0	0	---	---	x	---	---	---
Sunshine School Jane Smith, Tchr.		0	AA	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0											
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
---	10/10	2	10/16 10/19 10/23	2	---	---	---	---	4.5	0	0	40.50	0	2	0
4	2/7 2/11	3 1	2/15 2/22 2/26 2/27 3/1 3/6 3/12 3/20	3 -to- 7	3/27	A/S	---	---	20 hrs.	.8	4.25	388.25	0	7	0
●	---	---	---	---	---	T S T S P T A	2 3 2	---	3.	.25/ Trip	---	27.00	0 0 0	1 1 1	1 1 1
1	---	---	---	---	12/3 12/8	A A	1 1	---	4.5	.50/ trip	2.70	66.60	0 0	1 1	0 0
I.P. (11)	2/20 3/7 5/9	1 1 1	11/ 11/	50 est.	---	A A/S	9	11/	19.	1.5	4.00	258.40	323.80	50. est.	6
---			---	---		---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
17			2/22 3/1 3/8 3/15 3/22 3/29 4/5 7/12	15 -to- 20		A A/S	2 1	2/14 2/20	37.	3.25	11.40	495.60	1,790.80	20	0
---	3/29	3	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	5.70	x	3	0
●	---	---	5/2 5/10	2	---	T T	2 2	5/2 5/8	1. 1.	.25 .25	---	9. 9.	0 0	2 2	10 10

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	Component	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0 1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
63. San Jose Unified Cen. Ofc. Dennis Mann, R. Tchr.		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
64. San Leandro John Muir Jr. High		0	0	0	✓	---	---	---	---	---
65. San Luis Obispo Co. Cen. Ofc. Patricia Dyer, Coor.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
66. San Mateo County Cen. Ofc. T. S. Murdock, Coor. Palos Verdes School Jennifer Kennedy, Soc. Wkr. Dipphasia Program Alice Montgomery, Tchr.		0	AA	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
67. San Ramon Valley Unified Country Club School Ann Lukas, Tchr. Walt Disney School Naomi Dowley, Tchr.		0	0	0	---	---	---	---	---	---
68. Santa Ana Unified Valley High R.K. Theriot, Asst. Prin.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
69. Santa Barbara County Cen. Ofc. S.R. Ottman, Dir.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---
70. Santa Clara Unified Cen. Ofc. Richard H. Guertin, Coor.		0	0	0	---	---	✓	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A P S T O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. +1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.235	0	0	3.78	x	x	x
I.P. +2	2/15 3/1 3/26 5/8	5 3 1 3	3/19	40	---	---	---	---	15.035	1.0	4.00	158.06	1,151.00	40	0
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
[redacted]	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
71. Santa Cruz City Schools Cen. Ofc. Kenneth A. Lamb, Dir.	x	x	x	---	✓	---	---	---	---
72. Santa Cruz County Schools Cen. Ofc. Richard D. Struck, Dir. Mentally Disordered Minors Program Burnis Lyons, Eval. Shirley Foster, Tchr.	AA	AA	O	✓	---	---	---	---	---
73. Shasta County Cen. Ofc. Oliver Neely, Asst. Supt. H. Greer, Ed. Cons.	O	O	O	✓	---	---	---	---	---
74. Simi Valley Cen. Ofc. Stanley Norton, Dir. Mt. View Elementary Bob Gottschalk White Oak Elementary Peter Esau, Prin. Simi Valley High School Robert J. Jacob, Prin.	O	O	O	✓	---	---	---	---	---
75. Stanislaus County Cen. Ofc. Paul Hiller, Asst. Supt.	x	x	x	---	---	✓	---	---	---
76. Stanislaus Union Chrysler School Janice Beltram, Tchr. Robert Austin, Tchr.	O	O	O	✓	---	---	---	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P. +1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.135	0	0	1.46	x	x	x
I.P. (2) +2	3/15	2	---	---	---	T O	3	5/15	16.070	3.5	17.50	227.12	330.00	3	0
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P. +1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.135	0	0	2.82	x	x	x
I.P. (2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.070	0	0	2.12	x	x	x

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts	ADOPTION AO ADAPTION AA UNCERTAIN X NO 0 0.0			INITIAL AWARENESS			SECONDARY AWARENESS		
Component	1	2	3	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE
77. Stockton Unified (Cross Reference: Private/ Stockton Children's Home) Sarelle Cohen, Tchr.	x	x	x	---	---	✓	--	---	---
78. Sunnyvale Schools Cen. Ofc. A. J. Mattela, Dir.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
79. Sweetwater Union High Cen. Ofc. Milton Grossman, Dir.	0	0	0	---	---	✓	--	---	---
80. Tahoe Truckee Unified Tahoe-Truckee High Wayne Scholl, Dean	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
81. Tehama County Cen. Ofc Paul Redden	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
82. Torrance Arnold School P. Barretta, Coun.	0	0	0	✓	---	---	--	---	---
83. Tustin Elementary Cen. Ofc. Bailey McCrue, Dir.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
84. Ukiah Unified Pomalita Jr. High Duane C. Thompson, Tchr. Ukiah High Roy Alexander, Tchr. Evelyn S. Broaddas, Tchr. Jean Brown, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---

2.0			4.0		5.0											
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A P T O S A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
I.P. +1	2/1	3	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.00	0	0	15.90	219.00 (21 hrs.)	3	0	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.135	0	0	2.42	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x	
I.P. (4)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.140	0	0	4.24	x	x	x	

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES: 1.0

Therapeutic Educational Center

Public School Districts

ADOPTION AO
ADAPTION AA
UNCERTAIN X
NO 0

0.0

Component	1	2	3	INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	INITIAL AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	INITIAL AWARENESS: OTHER	SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	SECONDARY AWARENESS: A-Admin. T-Teach. S-Stud. P-Parent O-Other A/S-Ancil.	SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE
85. Upland Upland Jr. High Robt. Smith, Tchr.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
86. Vacaville Unified Markam Elementary Roger Foressell, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
87. Valley Oaks Union Conejo Elementary Norman Glenn, Prin.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
88. Westminister Cen. Ofc. Betty Darke, Coor.	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---
89. Yuba-Sutter County Cen. Ofc. Walter Swanson	0	0	0	✓	---	--	--	---	---

78

2.0			4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL		
	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A T S P O A/S	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	PROF. STAFF TIME EXPENDED (Hours)	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x
I.P.	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	--	.035	0	0	1.06	x	x	x